Ji-93 997.

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1893-94
192
(L. R.)

File No. 81 993.
Serial Nos. 1—16

Later references.

L. R. 5469.02.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1—16

In ~~Part~~ B for December 1896.

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Govindrao & Mayachandra, Chamaftar talak, regarding the transfer of patta to Sirsi revenue.

WD 2258—GPF—20,000—11-6-20

(21) ~~(420)~~ Memo

Petition No 3560 of 94-95

Petitioner
Govindaiya

Counter Petitioners
Shanbhog Ramaiya
and others

Subject:

Appeal against the order of the Deputy Commr of Bangalore declining to transfer the Patta of 6 land bearing No 273 in Mogenhalli, Channapatna Taluk, from the name of Gopalakrishnadevaru to that of Petitioner.

The case was heard on 10th September 95, and orders were reserved pending receipt of the records relating to Pujari Krishnappa's Darkhast for the land in question, called for in this office No $\frac{Rel}{5-98}$ dated 7th September 95. The Deputy Commr not having forwarded the records as promised in his

docket- dated 9th September 95;
he was requested in this office
No 809 922nd October 95- to submit-
them without further delay.
In reply, the Deputy-Commr
forwarded Closepet-Sub-or
Officer's Memo No 298 dated
16th November 95; which is
to the effect that the records in
question were sent- to the
Shekdar for some alteration
in the Muchilika which had
been executed by the villagers
but- were not- returned, nor
filed in the record, and that-
orders are issued to the Amildar
to submit- the explanation
of the Shekdar to whom the
records were sent: Thereupon
the Deputy-Commr was asked,
in this office No $\frac{5-286}{1093}$ 9 9th Dec 95,
- make a clear report- as
whether the records referred
were forthcoming or not:
In reply, the Deputy-Commr now

"vide his No 490 of 27.

3

~~24~~ 15

Before the Government of ~~His Highness the Maharaja of~~ Mysore.

Appeal No. 3500 of 1894-95.

Appellant. Vs. Respondent.

V Govindaraja

Shanthoji Ramaiya
2. Patil Bandi Gowda
3. Siddi Gowda
4. Honnaji Gowda.

Notice served.
2nd Respondent states that he is sick
Case taken and considered.

10. 9. 95.

Parties in person.

Order reserved. Awaiting receipt of the record applied for in Amildar's Court No 248 dated 9th Sept 95.

10/9

Vide Re. Sergeant & Conr. letter No. 20 & 21. 4. 96.

state as follows:-

"A thorough search was made for the same, but they are not forthcoming in the records of the Taluk, nor in those of the Sub Taluk, which had remained unrelieved. The 'To' and 'From' Registers were also referred to. A remark made in the 'From' Register of 1888-89, shows that the record was sent to the Sheristar for obtaining the Panchilikai, but there is nothing to show that it was so sent to the Sheristar. It appears all the papers in the Sub Taluk. The then Headmunshi of the Sub Taluk is reported to have died and the other gumastas are not now in the Taluk."

S.V.

(1)

(General Serial No. 32.)

1894.

No. 3206

Name of Petitioner. Govindiah son of Krishna

Village. Nagenahalli

Taluk. Channapatna

District. Bangalore

Date of Arzi. May 1894

Date of Receipt. 8-5-94

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. four

ABSTRACT.

(1). The dry land survey no: 273 of the above village is in their (his) husband's possession since a very long time & has been paying assessment on it every year.

(2) There is no reason to prohibit the Patel from the said assessed land in the name of god Gopalakrishna Swamy of the said village. This is all a set up of the Shanbhag & the Patail who have contrived to establish the said no: 273 as "Dhal Inamti".

(3) If it was really an inamti some records must be forthcoming to prove the statement. But on the other hand when he applied for copies of the same he received an endorsement to the effect that the said temple contains no inamti according to the Inam Register sent to the Taluk by the Survey Superintendent.

(4)

L.R. 81-93-1

Re Dy Commr's proposal x
ors & Vcl^r
Mr urges that no enq^y was made
in reply to his appeals to the
Comm^r & the Govt^r

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Ord 1885 19 3206 21-5-94

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

(2)

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 3206

dated May 94. received at the

Dewan's Office from Private Secretary to His Excellency
A. Macfarlane, Chief Secretary to Government
requesting that the enclosed petition
addressed to the Officiating Chief Secretary to Government
may be returned to the petitioner
~~with the remarks of the Dewan's Office~~
for necessary disposal —

is forwarded, together with its four

enclosures, to the Private Secretary to His Excellency the Governor
for disposal and return
to Petitioner.

L.R. 81-93-2

By Order,

19/5

Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE, 19
May 1894

19/5

M.G.C.P.Bangalore.—3-5-94.—1,000.

Rec'd 24/7/94 3/1307

Petition Branch

Please put up the Reference Standard -

(General Serial No. 30.)

OFFICE OF THE 1145.

1894 JUL 25 P 1

6309

From

The Dy Commissioner Bangalore District

To

The Chief Secretary to the Govt of Mysore

Dated Bangalore 24th July/94.

Despatched

Received L. R. 81 93-3

Enclosures No.

Delayed by reminder No 3206 dt 1/8

General No.

No. 97.

Rec'd 3/8/94

Reference Section.

Copy to be transferred in Petitions Book

Thad 6/8/94

Copy to be transferred in Petitions Book

24/8/94

Rec'd 7/8.

Copy of the report promised.

24/8/94

Sir I have the honour to submit herewith a petition from Govindiah and his younger sister of Survey No. 273 in Bangalore Taluk

According to the rules, the Revenue Standard Rate per Acre for Bangalore Taluk

D 15-9-94

427

Said Physician called,
discharged and his prescriptions examined. He has been reminded.

Emma Reed

Asst. Superintendent

Gen. Serial No. 31.]

7861.

1894-95 R1. 365

From

The Dy Commissioner
Bangalore Dist

To

Chief
The Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 12th December 1894
Despatched
Received 14th Dec 94

Enclosures—No. 1 file

General No.
D No. 692 / A. R. 81-93-4

Peta
15.12.94

The Rev. Branch.

Please look up the references
to your Branch on 6/8/94
Ref. 1145 / R-309 (2.97 & 26-7-94)
D.C Bangalore.

5
15.
No 1145 / R 309 referred to in the above
is transferred to the Pet Br on 7/8/94

21/12/94

No 1885-94 19th May 1894

Submitted to the Chief.

24/12

7 destroyed
Cuddapah
Treasuries

Civil official memo No 40 dated 10th July 1894 forwarding a petition from Govindu Son of Krishnia of Mogenahally, Chenna-patna Taluk anent the transfer of Patta of Survey No 273 to Gopal Krishna Devaru's name and enquiring why no action was taken on his reference No 1885 dated 19th May last.

12

In returning the enclosures of the above, has the honor to state that the Chief Secretary's No P 1885 dated 19th May 1894 forwarding for disposal and endorsement, a petition from Govindia in the matter was sent to the Sub division office for Compliance. That officer having instituted enquiries and reported that the land in Question was assigned to the Temple and the Petitioner has been informed of it.

K. Ramaswamy

for Dy. Commissioner

M

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
RECEIVED 3206
DATE 8-6-74

13

4

5

6

1

2

3

4

(a) [illegible] 15- 1- [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 130 [illegible]

[illegible]

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಎಸ್‌ಡಬ್ಲ್ಯೂಎಸ್‌ಎಸ್‌ಬಿ/ಟಿಎಸ್‌ಪಿ/ಟಿಇಸಿ/ಇಎಲ್‌ಸಿ/ಎಸ್‌ಎಸ್‌ಎಸ್‌

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ

ದಿನಾಂಕ

ಸಭೆಯ ನಡವಳಿ

ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಿದವರು ಶ್ರೀ/ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ———

ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಿದ ವಿಷಯವೆಂದರೆ ———

ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹಾಜರಿದ್ದರು ———

ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚಿಸಿದ ವಿಷಯಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡ ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳ

239

(10)

Gen. Serial No. 32.]

1895

No. 3560

Name of Petitioner. Ferreira

Village. Mogenahalli

Taluk. Channapatna

District. Bangalore

L.R. 81-93-S

Date of Arzi. 16-6-95

Date of Receipt. 28-6-95

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. 2

ABSTRACT.

In continuation of his previous petitions Cabinet Endorsement No. 7[illegible] 9/10-12-94 from the Dy. Comr. Bangalore dated. which is as follows.

Your petitions of 30th June and 4th may last submitted to Govt. complaining that dry land Survey No. 273 which was in your Enjoyment had been resumed in Gopala Krishna Devaru name - have been referred both of you for disposal - the previous proceedings in the matter and Memo No. 2340/28 October last submitted by the Sub-Division officer were before them.

It is understood that the land had

[illegible] Lucas de Jodi attached to the
[illegible] - that it had been with [illegible]
[illegible] name of the Rajas - that during the
settlement of Jaun the land was attached
and incorporated with Port. and that sub
sequently the palla of the land was in com-
plicity with the request of the villagers
and Rajas [illegible] made in the name of the
deity -

4/7/95.

21

Received in Supreme Court on 25-2-95

2321
2491 Submitted to the Council on 15/3/95

3561
2/3/95

Index

Sheet

PETITION DEPARTMENT
NUMBER 3561
DATE 28-2-95

In the Supreme Court of India

Civil Appellate Jurisdiction

Special Leave Petition (Civil) No. of 1995

(Under Article 136 of the Constitution of India from the Judgment and Order dated the 15th day of December, 1994 of the Delhi High Court in Civil Writ Petition No. 1515 of 1994)

Between

1. Ashok Kumar Yadav
2. Haryana Congress (T)
3. Bhajan Lal

Petitioners

And

1. State of Haryana
2. Union of India

Respondents

To

The Hon'ble the Chief Justice of India and His Companion Judges of the Supreme Court of India

The humble petition of the petitioners above named

Most Respectfully Showeth:

1. That the petitioners have filed the present petition against the judgment and order dated 15th December, 1994 of the Delhi High Court in Civil Writ Petition No. 1515 of 1994 whereby the Delhi High Court has dismissed the writ petition filed by the petitioners challenging the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

2. That the petitioners are filing the present petition within limitation as the last date for filing the petition is 28th February, 1995.

3. That the petitioners have not filed any other petition in this Hon'ble Court against the impugned judgment and order.

4. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

5. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

6. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

7. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

8. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

9. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

10. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

11. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

12. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

13. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

14. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

15. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

16. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

17. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

18. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

19. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

20. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

21. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

22. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

23. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

24. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

25. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

26. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

27. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

28. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

29. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

30. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

31. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

32. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

33. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

34. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

35. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

36. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

37. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

38. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

39. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

40. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

41. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

42. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

43. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

44. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

45. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

46. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

47. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

48. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

49. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

50. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

51. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

52. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

53. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

54. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

55. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

56. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

57. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

58. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

59. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

60. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

61. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

62. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

63. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

64. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

65. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

66. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

67. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

68. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

69. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

70. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

71. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

72. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

73. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

74. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

75. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

76. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

77. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

78. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

79. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

80. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

81. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

82. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

83. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

84. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

85. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

86. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

87. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

88. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

89. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

90. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

91. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

92. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

93. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

94. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

95. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

96. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

97. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

98. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

99. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

100. That the petitioners have a fundamental right to challenge the validity of the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Act, 1994 and the Haryana Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Rules, 1994 framed thereunder.

ﺩﻓﺘﺮ ﺍﻧﺠﻤﻦ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺑﺎﻟﻤﻘﺎﺑﻞ ﺩﻓﺘﺮ ﻣﺪﺭﺳﻪ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺍﻧﺠﻤﻦ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺑﺎﻟﻤﻘﺎﺑﻞ ﺩﻓﺘﺮ ﻣﺪﺭﺳﻪ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ

ﺍﻧﺠﻤﻦ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺑﺎﻟﻤﻘﺎﺑﻞ ﺩﻓﺘﺮ ﻣﺪﺭﺳﻪ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺍﻧﺠﻤﻦ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺑﺎﻟﻤﻘﺎﺑﻞ ﺩﻓﺘﺮ ﻣﺪﺭﺳﻪ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ

ﺍﻧﺠﻤﻦ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺑﺎﻟﻤﻘﺎﺑﻞ ﺩﻓﺘﺮ ﻣﺪﺭﺳﻪ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺍﻧﺠﻤﻦ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺑﺎﻟﻤﻘﺎﺑﻞ ﺩﻓﺘﺮ ﻣﺪﺭﺳﻪ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ

ﺍﻧﺠﻤﻦ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺑﺎﻟﻤﻘﺎﺑﻞ ﺩﻓﺘﺮ ﻣﺪﺭﺳﻪ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺍﻧﺠﻤﻦ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺑﺎﻟﻤﻘﺎﺑﻞ ﺩﻓﺘﺮ ﻣﺪﺭﺳﻪ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ

ﺍﻧﺠﻤﻦ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺑﺎﻟﻤﻘﺎﺑﻞ ﺩﻓﺘﺮ ﻣﺪﺭﺳﻪ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺍﻧﺠﻤﻦ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺑﺎﻟﻤﻘﺎﺑﻞ ﺩﻓﺘﺮ ﻣﺪﺭﺳﻪ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ

ﺍﻧﺠﻤﻦ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺑﺎﻟﻤﻘﺎﺑﻞ ﺩﻓﺘﺮ ﻣﺪﺭﺳﻪ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺍﻧﺠﻤﻦ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺑﺎﻟﻤﻘﺎﺑﻞ ﺩﻓﺘﺮ ﻣﺪﺭﺳﻪ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ

ﺍﻧﺠﻤﻦ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺑﺎﻟﻤﻘﺎﺑﻞ ﺩﻓﺘﺮ ﻣﺪﺭﺳﻪ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺍﻧﺠﻤﻦ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺑﺎﻟﻤﻘﺎﺑﻞ ﺩﻓﺘﺮ ﻣﺪﺭﺳﻪ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ

ﺍﻧﺠﻤﻦ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺑﺎﻟﻤﻘﺎﺑﻞ ﺩﻓﺘﺮ ﻣﺪﺭﺳﻪ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺍﻧﺠﻤﻦ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺑﺎﻟﻤﻘﺎﺑﻞ ﺩﻓﺘﺮ ﻣﺪﺭﺳﻪ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ

ﺍﻧﺠﻤﻦ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺑﺎﻟﻤﻘﺎﺑﻞ ﺩﻓﺘﺮ ﻣﺪﺭﺳﻪ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺍﻧﺠﻤﻦ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺑﺎﻟﻤﻘﺎﺑﻞ ﺩﻓﺘﺮ ﻣﺪﺭﺳﻪ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ

ﺍﻧﺠﻤﻦ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺑﺎﻟﻤﻘﺎﺑﻞ ﺩﻓﺘﺮ ﻣﺪﺭﺳﻪ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺍﻧﺠﻤﻦ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ ﺑﺎﻟﻤﻘﺎﺑﻞ ﺩﻓﺘﺮ ﻣﺪﺭﺳﻪ ﺍﺳﻼﻣﻴﻪ

Pet 16

20-8-95

8-7-95

(10) P (4)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

96

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Appeal Petition No. 3566 dated 16-8-95 received at the Dewan's Office from Pujari Gowda of Mopidalee Chennapatna Taluk, complaining of ~~the decree~~ ~~of the Deputy Commissioner dated~~ ~~upon regarding~~ the boundary of the Patta of No. 273 in Mopidalee & Kharab of Gopala Gowda &c is forwarded, together with its enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner of Bangalore District for a very early report with ~~submission of~~ the entire proceedings connected with the case, ~~together with a full report of the facts of the case, and on the points urged in the petition.~~

2. The petition with its enclosure should be returned.

L.R. 81-93-6

By order,

5-7-95

BANGALORE,
5-7-1895

~~Chief~~ Secretary.

Revd

M.G.C.P.B.—25-4-95—1,000

Gen. Serial No. 31

(13) 1895-96 (12)

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Gl. No. 14754
Vol. 4
4 AUG. 95
Pet 168
DEWAN'S OFFICE

From The Dy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To The Secretary to the Revenue Govt.
Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 17th August 1895.

Despatched 19th Do

Received

Enclosures—No. 1 file

General No.

D No. 182.

The Revenue Secretary's No. 16 Pet. dated 5th Ultimo, forwarding a petition from Pujari Govindia of Mogenahally, Chennapatna Taluk complaining of the transfer of the Patta of survey No. 273 in the village to the name of Gopalakrishna devaru

In returning the enclosures of the above, has the honor to submit the entire record of the case, the

Very urgent

Gen. 31.]

189 (72) (73)

From

29

To

The Deputy Commr
Bangalore District

Dated
Despatched 9th } Sept 1895
Received

General No. Pet
No. 698.

L.R. 81-938

Endorsed No.

His docket No 132 dated 17th August 1895, submitting the records connected with the appeal of Govindaraja of Mogenhalli, Channapatna Taluk, regarding the Patta of Inam No 273 of the village, which is in the name of Gopalakrishna Chetty.

With reference to the above he has the honour to state that the Inamdar of Mogenhalli for the year

Read copies of the records regarding the
1879-80 ~~[illegible]~~

~~the~~ Application of Rajaji
Krishnaraja for the land, the
Petitioner stated that the Patel
of the land ~~=~~ he made in
the name of the deity, ~~the~~ Commander of
~~the~~ the Amildar on 7.1.80 directing
~~Patel~~ Patel to be made
Recording, ~~and~~ a Muchalika executed by
~~him~~ the Shanbhog, the Patel
and 2 Ryots to the effect
that they would be
responsible for payment
of Kandayam of the land;
And to request that the
entire Records relating to
the said Amildari including the
Muchalika, which may be found
to this office may be transmitted

2. As very early Reply
is required, as the appeal
of Govindaraja should be filed
by 10th inst. for hearing.

By Order

Draft
(Approved by
order of the
3rd Commissioner) 7/9 for Recommendation

SC 7/9.

Gen. Serial No. 31.] Ad. No. 1295 No. 1176

(12) 189 SEP 95

REVENUE DEPARTMENT * DEWAN'S OFFICE *

From The Hy C Commissioner
31 Bangalore District

To Revenue
The Secretary to the Govt
of Mysore.

Dated 6th September 95.
Despatched Do
Received

Enclosures—No.

General No.
Do No. 248

~~Re~~ Pet
Hbh
10/9/95
Report in proper Office

L-R-81-93-9

The Revenue Secretary's
No. 598 Pet dated 7th instant
calling for certain papers
connected with the appeal
of Sowdia of Mosenahully,
Chennapatna Taluk re-
-garding the Patta of
Inaji No. 273.

I Adverting to the
above, I have the honor
to state that the Amildar
having reported that
the papers referred to
were sent to the Sub
Division Officer, that

Officer has this day been requested to furnish them forthwith and they will be submitted as soon as they are received.

K. Chaudy

For Dy Commissioner
Lands

Rec'd 18/9/95

Ref

N 18/9/95

Reference ~~should belong~~ to the Petition Branch.

23/9

Transferred to the Petn. Branch

RD
23/9

Placed in the file

Ls
24/9.

L. R. 81-93-10

The record has not yet been received.

received

received

24/10/95

Drafted
Ds
22-10-95

Ref 20/9 16

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Gl. No. 2519
No. 1083
28 SEP 95
DEWAN'S OFFICE

Gen. Serial [No. 31.]

1895-96. Pl. 237.

From The Dy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore.

Dated 16th September 1895.
Despatched 18th —— Do ——
Received

Enclosures—No. 1.

General No.
No. 293.

This Office No. 248 dated 9th Instant, amant certain papers called for in connection with Kasi No. 273 of Inoscantally, Chennapatna Taluk.

Has the honor to forward the telegram received from the Sub Division Officer, Closepet.

K Chandy
Dy. Commissioner.

No. M2904.—5,000 Pds. **SOUTHERN MAHRATTA RAILWAY.** 31 Tl. 5a.

LICENSED TELEGRAPHS

MESSAGE FORM.

Class. | 10 | Local No.

To (Station) Ramdurg | From (Station) Gadag

No.	Words.	Time tendered for transmission (Railway time.) Day.	Hour.	Minute.	Official Instructions.
3		23/3 11	8	45	

To (Person) The Deputy Commissioner | From (Person) Sub. Divisional Officer

1		2		3	
4	Number	5	121	6	asking
7	submission	9	Gopal	9	Kurunna
10	dakhast	11		12	accepted
13	tenth	14	received	15	tenth
16	evening	17	cannot	18	Thereof
19	Complied	20		21	
22		23		24	
25		26		27	
28		29		30	
31		32		33	
34		35		36	
37		38		39	
40		41		42	
43		44		45	
46		47		48	

Signature of sender.

Received From

At Hrs. Min. on the

By

Sent To

At Hrs. Min. on the

By

Date 11-4-15

Signature in Charge.

Forward for
forwarded
and sign at
again treated
received on
for service
11

Gen. Serial No. 3[illegible]

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Gl. No. 6261
Pet No 372
28 NOV. 1895
R.S.C.

19 ~~19~~

From
The Dy Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

To
Revenue
The Secretary to the Govt.
~~Dewan~~ of Mysore.

Dated 27th Nov 1895.

Despatched 28th do

Received

Enclosures—No. 1 (Petition of Pls &c with Govt Order 5380 of 1894-97 17/12/94)

General No.
D No. 490.

Sir Official Memo: Pet of the 22nd ult. No. 809 calling for certain papers connected with the appeal of Govindia of Moyenahalli of Channapatna Taluk

L.R. 81 93-12

Has the honor to Submit in original Memo No. 298 of the 16th instant from the Sub Divisional Officer, Closepet, in the matter

Yr Obedt Servt
Dy Commissioner

Ger - Copies
Regd 5
27/11/95

Ret'd with Papers
5/12
Q - is not stayed whether it would be necessary or not -
Dept Inclr writing, in a clear hand on the head
5/12
Rec'd & replied
dt 6-12-95

Gen. 31.]

Wright

1895 18

From

The Rev. Secretary to M
Govt of Mysore

To

The Deputy Commr.
Bangalore Distn

Dated

Despatched 22 22nd October 1895

Received

General No. Pol- 809

No. L. R. 81-93-

Enclosure No. —

In drawing his attention
(1) his docket No 248 dated
9th September 1895 stating
that the records called for
in this Office No Pol- 598 97
Idem with reference to the
appeal of Govindra of
Mogenhalli, Channapatna
Taluk, regarding the
Patta of Maji No 273, would
be sent immediately
on receipt from the
Sub Division Officer,
Closepett, and.
(2) his docket No 293 dated
16th Septr 1895 forwarding
a telegram from the
Sub Dn Officer to the effect

that the papers could not
be sent before the date
fixed for the hearing of
the appeal, viz 10th Sept. 1895

I have the honor to observe
that the papers referred to
have not been received
as yet and to request their
submission without further
delay.

'By Order'

Draft

Rev. Secretary

Rmp

(23) ~~(34)~~

(General Serial No. 30.)

REVENUE ... Gl. No. 7987 Pet. No. 686 24 APR. ... LANDS OFFICE

39

189 .

From The Deputy Commissioner Bangalore District.

To

The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the ~~Durbar~~ Government of Mysore, General Revenue department Bangalore.

Dated 21st April 1896.

Despatched 22nd Do

Received

Enclosures No.

General No.

D. No. 1020

In reply to Secretary's No. 3286 dated 9th December 1895. P. 1098

L.R. 81-93-14

Reports that the records in re Distribution of Ground = appa of Bhogavalli Chennapatna Taluk, are not forthcoming.—

Peti 22-4-96

References to the marked.

Petitioner Ro

22/4/96

Papers were sent to petitioner Ro on 23.4.96.

M. G. C. P.—31-1-94—3000.

23/4-

Gen. 30.] D. of L. 1895 ~~20~~ 20

38.

From

The Revenue Secretary to the Government of Mysore.

To

The Deputy Commissioner Bangalore Dt

Dated 9th December 1895

Despatched to

Received

General No. 5-286 / *P. No.* 1093

Enclosure No. Nil.

L.R. 81-93-13

With reference to his docket No. 490 dated 27-11-95, forwarding a memo, regarding the Sub Officer Chenapatna, regarding the submission of certain papers called for in connection with the appeal of Govindia of Magenahalli in the Chennapatna Tk, has the honor to observe that it is not stated whether the records referred to, are forthcoming or not; and to request that he will be so good as to make a clear report on the point.

By order

D of L

9-12-95.

Revenue Secretary

D of L

6-12-95

~~43~~ (29)

Proceedings of the Govt of Mysore

Read:-

(1) Petition No 3566 dated 16th June 1895 presented by Govindaiya of Nagenhalli Channapatna Taluk complaining that Nagi No 1227 of the village which has been in his possession for a long time has unjustly been granted in the name of Gopalakrishna Setty in the village, and praying for its transfer to his name.

L.R. 81-93-V8

(2) Records of the case received with docket No 182 dated 17th August 1895 from the Deputy Commr, Bangalore district.

(3) Revenue Secretary's docket No $\frac{\text{Rel}}{5-95}$ dated 4th September 95 to the D/ Mysore Bangalore Dt stating that the Kaumijante Jabitha of the village for 1894-95 refers to an application of Rajaiah

Kirikiriroa for the land, & the
settlement of the dispute
that the Partition of the land
made in the name of
the deity, and & an Act of the
Assembly dated 7th January
1880 directing Partition to be
made accordingly, &c, and
requesting the Registrar
to forward the entire records
relating to the said Partition
(4) Correspondence ending
with letter of no date 21st
April 1880, from the Registrar
Cannon, Bay of Plenty District,
reporting that the records
relating to the Partition
are not forthcoming.

—4—

Order No. 55-80 Page 97 1/4

Though the Registrar communicated
with the Partition for the
land by Pipiri Kirikiriroa
are

Law: Kvo (Index + Sub: Dir. officials no: 298-original) + Vers
records. (Record not checked, but Register Nos: 1001)
were missing at time new Kvo entry pages 13 missing)

Sent to the Sheikdar for obtaining the Moochilka, but there is nothing to shew that it was so sent to the Sheikdar.

2. It appears all this transpired in the Sub Taluk. The then Head Moonshee of the Sub Taluk is reported to have died and the other Gumastas are not now in the Taluk.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedient Servant

Dy Commissioner

WHG

~~43~~ (29)

Proceedings of the Govt of Mysore

Read:—

(1) Petition No 3560 dated 16th June 1895 presented by Govindaiya of Mogenhalli Channapatna Taluk complaining that the patta of Inaji No 273 of the village which has been in his possession for a long time was unjustly made in the name of Gopala Krishna Devaru in the village, and praying for its transfer to his name.

L.R. 87-93-V6

(2) Records of the case received with docket No 182 dated 17th August 1895 from the Deputy Commr, Bangalore District.

(3) Revenue Secretary's docket No Pet/5-95 dated 7th September 95, to the Dy Comr Bangalore Dt stating that the Kammi Jasti Jakhta of the village for 1879-80 refers to an application of Rajan

No: 3560 Sec: 2.

(27)

L.R. 61-93-16

(6)

are not forthcoming, it is evident, from the Amildar's Shara in the Kammi jasti Takhlā of the village for 1879-80, that the Pujari consented to the land being registered in the name of the Deity. The registry was so made and acquiesced in by the Pujari, the Petitioner's father during his lifetime.

2. There is no ground to transfer the land to the name of the Petitioner, as prayed for by him, after this length of time.

3. As Pujari, Petitioner may continue to enjoy the land, as he has been doing since the death of his father whom he succeeded.

This

This petition is therefore rejected dismissed.

Draft-

For Secretary

C 283

To

The Deputy-Commr
Bangalore District, with
records & copy of Endt granted
to the Petitioner.

16/12/96.

Noted
16/12/96 18-1-97

Draft

By Order

For Secretary

16/12/96